



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## LA SCIENCE SOCIALE.

---

### THE FRENCH SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

The editors of the *ANNALS* have asked me to indicate the cause of the division that took place seven years ago in the school founded by Le Play. I willingly respond to this request, not that I may have opportunity to rehearse the painful incidents connected with the history of the case, but that I may give to the American public, interested in social studies, a clear and exact idea of the way in which we are continuing in the *Science Sociale* the task which was undertaken by Le Play. I shall put aside, then, all personal questions, and confine myself to the grounds of the division which took place, to the underlying causes which determined it, and not to the circumstances which occasioned it.

The school founded by Le Play has always had two classes of adherents. One class adhered to the truths advanced by the master and zealously used all the means in their power to spread the doctrine. The others, struck by the results to which Le Play had been led by the method of scientific observation which he employed, were, above all, attracted by this method; they wished to master it, to advance it, if possible, to perfect it.

The first regarded Le Play as a deliverer. After the disasters of 1870 every Frenchman looked for a man who should indicate the line of policy which, followed out, would uplift France. Le Play was one of these deliverers; and many at that time grouped themselves about him under the standard of the *Réform Sociale*.

The second looked upon Le Play as a scholar, capable not only of recognizing great general truths through scientific observation, but also of discovering by the same means those contingent truths which are necessary to any given society;

capable, not simply of giving valuable counsel in the matter of reform, but also of formulating those laws which lie at the foundation of all human societies.

The first saw in Le Play a fortunate navigator on the social seas, who had found a new route to certain truths. The second held that the means thus used to select the course would serve to determine other courses as well ; that it was much more rational to study thoroughly his methods, to learn to use his compass, and to take his reckonings, than to follow submissively in the track which he had laid down.

The first confined themselves to a sort of monopoly, after the manner of those Portuguese of the fifteenth century who exulted in having discovered the Azores and the route to the Cape. The second contemplated new voyages.

The reconciliation of these two different tendencies would not have been impossible, and one might easily imagine the two classes of disciples living in harmony, the first propagating those truths which the second strove to discover through scientific investigation.

So long as Le Play lived there was accord and mutual support between the representatives of the two classes ; but a short time after the founder's death, those who limited themselves to spreading the conclusions to which Le Play had arrived, saw with dismay, that disciples had gone so far as to employ the method of observation, and daringly advance propositions reached thereby which were not to be found in the master's writings. They looked upon these propositions as dangerous, they had grave fears for the doctrine itself, and thereupon the direction of the review which was the organ of the Unions for Social Peace and of the Society of Social Economy (*Unions de la Paix Sociale* and the *Société d'Économie Sociale* ) was taken from M. Edmond Demolins, who had been selected by Le Play himself. It was then that the "young school," as its adversaries called it, established a new review (*La Science Sociale*), and independent public lectures, that it might maintain freedom in its instruction.

To-day, after many years of laborious life, the "young school" is able to justify its existence, not only by its aspirations, but by its results, simply by showing what development it has given to the scientific method originated by Le Play. I hope that I may give my readers an adequate idea of the *raison d'être* of this school.

#### LE PLAY'S METHOD OF OBSERVATION.

Le Play's work consists of two divisions which are of very different tenor.

The first contains the various monographs published in the "Workingmen of Europe" (*Ouvriers Européens*). Here we find elements of observation analyzed with great care and classified with mathematical precision. The collection of these works received from the Academy of Sciences a prize in statistics; a large portion of the text is devoted to the budgets of the workingman's family. This is the basis of the work: it is with the material gathered from this long series of observations that Le Play carefully built up his system.

The second division he devotes to expounding and popularizing his views. Having succeeded in deriving a body of social doctrines from his observations, he directs all his efforts to an exposition of those doctrines in a form accessible to the general public. It was with this end in view that he published "Social Reform in France" (*La Réforme Sociale en France*), "The Organization of Labor" (*L'Organisation du Travail*), "The Organization of the Family" (*L'Organisation de la Famille*), "The Essential Constitution of Humanity" (*La Constitution essentielle de l'Humanité*), in short, a series of propagandist pamphlets which should bring to an ever increasing public the knowledge of those truths which are most needful to be put into practice, that reform may be hastened.

Between these two species of work, that of observation and that of exposition, there exists a close relation, since the

second is the result of the first, but this intimate connection was not recognized by the public. Those who contented themselves with reading "The Social Reform in France" considered it the expression of a profound philosophy; they accepted the conclusions which it advanced, or rejected them according to their own individual ideas; but it did not occur to them that a scientific result had been placed before them. Hence the false judgment which was formed of Le Play by many of his friends. Many followed him for the simple reason that he set forth certain cherished ideas of their own; they disregarded all others that he advanced, but they held that in the main it was desirable to disseminate the doctrine. I have myself known a magistrate, thoroughly imbued with the principles of our civil code to declare himself an ardent disciple of Le Play, although he differed from him fundamentally on the question of the system of inheritance, being convinced of the justice of enforced division. Others admitted testamentary liberty, but rejected the conclusions advanced in "Social Reform" in regard to the functions of the central government, etc. In short, they discussed doctrines instead of considering scientific results.

It would not have been half so unfortunate, if the scientific connection between conclusions and observations had been overlooked by those disciples only who were indifferent to method and curious only in regard to doctrine. Unfortunately it did not appear very clear to those who attempted to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the method, to those who were enrolled in the Society of Social Economy with the intention of continuing the studies of Le Play. It was no easy matter to follow in detail the scientific process by which Le Play had developed his doctrine from the basis of observation which he had analyzed.

Two causes contributed to this result:

The first, that the life of Le Play was absorbed in solitary study and that he must naturally have found for himself a method of work long before he thought of imparting it to

others. For more than twenty years his constant efforts to learn the secret of the life of society were sustained by his desire to know the truths necessary to the preservation of his own country : when he saw clearly the conditions of reform in France, he gave his chief attention to their exposition and the scientific regard for method was thrown into the background.

The second cause lay in the manner in which Le Play pursued his social studies. At first he sought to observe systems of society directly, as a whole ; but he soon saw that this method furnished much too vague results. After many gropings and fruitless attempts, to which he has himself made allusion in the first volume of the "Workingmen of Europe," he laid the true foundation of the method of social observation by determining the object of this observation, viz., the workingman's family. This was a real discovery. From that time social science was assured of its starting-point : its real existence began.

For Le Play personally it was still more. All his previous studies, confused until he adjusted them to the standard of the workingman's family, took on now their true value ; apparent contradictions disappeared ; obscure points became clear. In fact, after Le Play had laid hold of the real object of his observations he could immediately make use of the materials already analyzed, and begin the publication of his monographs on the family.

Between the founder of social science and those who were later to continue the work there was necessarily a considerable difference of preparation, which measures with sufficient clearness the difference in the results obtained. The former, dominated for many years by an ardent desire to understand the constitution of societies, could not set aside the important points of social organization which appeared beyond the limits of the workingman's family. In the countries which he had studied Le Play had an exact idea not only of the life in the workshops and of the customs of

the people, but also of the higher classes, of their influence in the commune, in the province, in the State ; not only of the material life, but of the intellectual and moral life, of the history of the society, of its rank in the world, etc. It was in order to see clearly into all these problems that he gave himself with enthusiasm to the study of the workingman's family. On the contrary, those of his disciples who, following his example, filled out the different divisions composing the outline of a monograph, were not guided, as he was, by a higher view ; frequently they remained on the low plane of an official report ; and if their observations could furnish Le Play valuable data, it often happened that they themselves were not fitted to profit by the information they had collected. Many, after having conscientiously gathered a great number of facts, were overwhelmed by them ; and although they completed their task, they did not advance science by a single step. I could name a certain scrupulous monographist who wrote and published a detailed study, and who declared openly that he believed that he had not done scientific work. The method of monographs seemed to him simply a tyranny which was to be endured out of respect to the master whose conclusions he adopted and whose doctrine he proposed to disseminate. Hence it happened that the Society of Social Economy, destined by Le Play to forward the studies which he had undertaken, was recruited by well-meaning men, who were disposed to strengthen by repeated observations the statements already made, rather than by men of science, who were desirous of showing through the development of method, new relations between varied social phenomena. In fact, it does not appear that the monographs published since the death of Le Play have enlarged the field of social science. It is an instrument which Le Play alone knew how to use, in order to pass from the workingman's family to society, from observation to a general view.

Further, the following grave defect is noticeable in the plan of the monographs : The outline comprises sixteen

divisions in which are contained the various elements of observation relative to the workingman's family. This is the invariable and essential part; there follows a second series of divisions which are without definite object and unlimited in number, and which give opportunity for adding all observations outside of the family, all that may lead to a knowledge of society. These are all placed under the vague title: *Important facts of social organization. Remarkable peculiarities. General estimates, Conclusions.* The title is in itself an admission of weakness. The scholar does not know how to classify these "important facts of social organization," or what to do with these "estimates." Because the investigator ran across them in the course of his study, and found them interesting, he added them to his work that they might not be lost, that is the whole story. As a matter of fact the method furnished by Le Play for the analysis of society could touch only the family; it leaves the study of the other social element to chance, and to the perspicacity of the individual.

This accounts for a fact frequently noted by all those who have thoroughly studied the monographs published in the collection of the "Workingmen of Europe" and the "Workingmen of the Two Worlds" (*Les Ouvriers des Deux Mondes*). I refer to the surprising inequality of the monographs, in the paragraphs devoted to the elements of observation which are outside of the workingman's family.

In the monographs written, either entirely or partially, by Le Play, these paragraphs furnish almost always very abundant and important data. Le Play saw by a process peculiar to himself what was worthy of note, what was characteristic of the society in question, what really constituted an important fact of social organization. We cite from the monograph on the "Bashkirs of the Ural," paragraph 18, on the nomads of Eastern Russia; from the "Peasants of Bousrah," paragraphs 17-21, on the régime of the community of Haouran; from "The Gunsmith of Solingen,"



paragraph 17, on the social constitution of the Anglo-Saxons, and paragraph 49, on the system of emigration of Westphalia; from "The Blacksmith of Buskerud," paragraph 17, on the social constitution of Norway; from "The Slovach Foundrymen," paragraphs 21 and 22, where there is to be found a curious study of South Slavic peoples, etc., etc. Many of the notes attached to the monographs on the "Workingmen of Europe" have evidently inspired the later writings of Le Play and have guided him in his work, while his disciples have often drawn their data from the same source.

On the contrary, in the writings of certain monographists who lack intuition, these paragraphs devoted to *important facts of social organization* frequently contain observations which are puerile or of a limited and special interest. I have no desire to give pain to any of the well-intentioned who have written on this subject, and I shall make no quotations; those of my readers who wish to see for themselves have only to refer to the collection of the "Workingmen of the Two Worlds." By the side of significant facts they will find insignificant details which throw no light on the subject observed, and seem to indicate that the monographist has failed to comprehend his work.

Such is one of the defects of the monographic method as Le Play presented it. It did not grasp society as a whole; it allowed facts of great importance to escape, so that a conscientious disciple could perform his task with exactness and follow with care every precept and yet fail to see the underlying causes of the prosperity or the wretchedness of the country where his observations were made.

But in the monographic system as instituted by Le Play there is another grave defect. Not only is the system incapable of dealing with the family in its relation to the elements of social organization which are outside it, but it cannot fully comprehend the family itself in its own organism. In reality it deals only with phenomena which can be expressed in

dollars and cents. The monograph proper consists, as Le Play himself says, in the description of the family contained in the domestic budget,\* and indeed it was under this form of simple budgets that Le Play's collection of monographs appeared in the first edition of the "Workingmen of Europe." Later, in publishing the second edition, Le Play thought it necessary to add to these budgets certain observations which would emphasize the conclusions which were in substance found in the text, but it was as a commentary or as explanatory notes, intended to facilitate the understanding of the budgets themselves. Observe, furthermore, how he expresses himself on this subject in the first volume of the second edition of the "Workingmen of Europe:" "One cannot, however, without too great brevity condense the description of a family into the list of its receipts and its expenses. Frequently, as I have said, a figure suffices to suggest an important conclusion to readers who are inclined to reflection ; but this disposition of mind is by no means universal."† It is, then, simply a question of calling the attention of those who are not accustomed to reflect to the conclusions which are drawn from the budget ; but it is the budget alone which is the basis of the work, the true groundwork of observation.

In restricting thus the field of his investigation, Le Play followed a habit of thought which he had contracted during his professional studies. He wished to subject the results of observation to the laws of mathematical science. The balance between the budget of receipts and the estimate of expenses seemed to him a means of verifying the data of the analysis, of verifying them numerically. He was carried away by this numerical verification, and hence he was led to neglect those phenomena which, because they could not be expressed in figures, would not accommodate themselves to his verification. And besides he himself has taken care to tell us by what false analogy he was guided : "The surest

\* "*Ouvriers Européens*," Second Edition, vol. i., p. 228.

† *Ibid.* Vol. i., p. 226.

means of knowing thoroughly the moral and the material life of men is much like the process which chemists use to learn the nature of minerals. A given mineral is known when by analysis it has been separated into the elements of which it is composed, and when it is found that the combined weight of all these elements is equal to that of the specimen that has been analyzed. A numerical verification of a similar nature may always be made by the scholar who analyzes carefully the existence of the social unit constituted by the family." \* According to this analogy he held that "all the acts which constitute the life of a workingman's family result more or less directly in an income or an outlay," and he concludes from this that the "observer possesses a complete knowledge of a family when he has analyzed all the items which are found on the debit and the credit side of the domestic accounts, and when he has obtained an exact correspondence between the two totals." †

There is here a considerable error, or rather a series of errors. In the first place, it is not true that all the acts which constitute the life of a family result *always*, even indirectly, in an income or in an outlay. For instance, the essential function of the family, the education of the children, cannot be expressed in figures. I notice that this item nowhere appears in the budgets given by Le Play. There is indeed one section (Section IV) which is set aside for *outlays for moral necessities, recreation and the demands of health*; but the moral necessities are subdivided under three distinct heads: religious worship, instruction of children, and charities. Of education no mention whatever is made: it is shown by a multitude of facts which could not be found in a budget. Nor is there anything there concerning the history of the family and its origin. Le Play devotes a special paragraph of the explanatory text to this most important subject; but in reality this portion of the text fails to explain the budget;

\* *Ibid.* Vol. i., p. 224.

† *Ibid.* Vol. i., p. 225.

it is rather appended to it. Here was a defect which he wished to conceal. What becomes then of the above-mentioned statement that the budget is to be the key to the situation? Besides, in the budget there is no indication of testamentary disposition of property, to which Le Play attached so much importance, nor does it deal with many points in family organization, with the relation of the employer to the employed, etc.

In the second place, if it is true that many acts of the life of the family result in a receipt or a disbursement, it is to be noticed that in case of certain acts this result is very indirect, and that the receipt or the expenditure which they occasion is in no way a measure of their importance. I open the first monograph in the collection of the "Workingmen of Europe," that on the Bashkirs, semi-nomadic shepherds of the Ural; I note that the instruction of the children costs sixty-three centimes per year, or on a basis of three children in a family, twenty-one centimes per capita; while the sum total of the family expense amounts to 643 francs, 36 centimes.\* If I rely on the budget, I conclude that the instruction is nearly nil and of very little importance. But on consulting the explanatory text we find: "All the children receive elementary instruction in a school under the supervision of the Moullah. The desire for instruction is increasing continually."† Further on, "The Moullah teaches gratuitously; this is part of his duties."‡ Evidently the fact is not presented in the same light in the columns of the budget and in the text. Again, the ragpicker of Paris§ spends not a penny in the name of religion; but he is represented to us as professing the Roman Catholic faith and deeply imbued with religious sentiment. He supports, with resignation, a none too fortunate lot; he thanks God every day for having given

\* *Ibid.* Vol. ii., p. 27.

† *Ibid.* Vol. ii., p. 4.

‡ *Ibid.* Vol. ii., p. 39.

§ *Ibid.* Vol. vi., pp. 259, 269 and 278.

him the necessities of life, and trusts to His care for the days that are to come. He likes to read with his family the Bible, or the other religious books which make his little library. Moreover, he has been a good and faithful soldier to His Holiness, the Pope. The zeros that figure in his expense account in connection with his religious life are no evidence in the eyes of the world of his religious practices.

One might multiply examples. Those that I have given will suffice to show what I mean. In fact, the instruction account shows only the schoolmaster's salary or the cost of school equipments ; it fails to record the instruction received in the family, the lessons learned from the father and the mother, and all that intellectual cultivation which is dependent on circumstances and environment, and which separates so widely the child raised on the seacoast, among fishermen and sailors, from the one raised in the interior of the country, among farmers or shepherds ; which makes the child brought up in the country different from the one educated in the city, etc., etc. All this has to do with a very important sort of knowledge. In several of his writings Le Play has made prominent the very considerable force of the training received outside of the school-house. In rehearsing the story of his own childhood and youth, he has been careful to tell us what he himself acquired, first from his association with the fishermen of Honfleur, and later from his intercourse with his uncle's friends at Paris.\*

Besides, in the matter of religion, which is essentially a matter of conviction, the budget shows only the exterior manifestations of worship, the purchase of tapers, the location of benches and chairs, and the expenses of burial. Are the amounts expended for these various objects the measure of that which attaches families to religion ? Certainly not. To look thus at religion is to look at it from a very insignificant point of view.

\* *Ibid.* Vol. i., pp. 17, 18, 20-24.

In the third place, even in dealing with facts that are purely material, the budget never gives more than one of the elements which should enter into a proper appreciation of them, that is the money value. The others are overlooked, because they do not admit of numerical verification when the accounts are balanced. It follows, then, that the investigation of the budget, no matter how painstaking it be, must give imperfect results. It is not enough to have learned that a workingman's family has 2000 francs in real estate, 3750 francs, fifty centimes in chattels; unless we are real estate agents or auctioneers interested solely in the selling price of real and personal property. He who makes a study of a family should know in what its property consists, its mode of acquirement and of disposition, etc.; whether it be inherited, or the product of the husband's thrift, or the dowry of the wife, all which points cannot enter into an estimate of money value.

It is quite another thing when the observations are made in countries where the ownership of land does not exist. Then not only the money value is not all, but it is nothing. I read in the monograph on the Bashkirs that the family has a small meadow estimated at eleven francs, forty-two centimes, a large meadow valued at eighty-five francs, sixty-five centimes, a kitchen garden worth twenty francs, fifty-six centimes, a hemp and flax field valued at twenty-eight francs, fifty-five centimes. Total, 146 francs, eighteen centimes.\* Just after this exact estimate I find the following note: "The meadows and the fields which each family cultivates are assigned to it as its own peculiar appropriation for a period of only fifteen years; afterward the municipal authorities proceed to a new distribution." In other words, the land is not sold, it is divided periodically. What, then, is the true value to a family of a meadow estimated at eleven francs, forty-two centimes?

The result of these various considerations is clearly that the study of the workingman's family, as well as the study

\* *Ibid.* Vol. ii, p. 8.

of society, cannot be restricted to the narrow limits of the domestic budget. M. de Tourville, impressed at once by the fruitfulness of Le Play's monographic observations, and by the imperfections of his methods, and observing, too, that he had recorded very many important facts which were unquestionably beyond the limits that he had established as a basis for his conclusions, attempted to co-ordinate the various orders of social facts, to discover their more intimate relations, and to secure by this means a plan of analysis, a classification which should serve as a guide for the researches of monographists. It was a question, in short, of remedying the two defects which I have noted, of comprehending the workingman's family in its various functions, and through the family, of comprehending the society itself.

## II.

### THE WORK OF M. DE TOURVILLE.

The chief characteristic of this new monographic system, that which distinguishes it pre-eminently from the one proposed by Le Play, is that all its different parts are intimately connected. As stated above, the monograph, as presented by Le Play, was an account of receipts and of expenditures, accompanied by two commentaries. The first bore the general title of "Preliminary Observations:" it was a sort of introduction, designed to facilitate an intelligent reading of the budget. The second under the name of "Important Facts of Social Organization," gave opportunity to the monographist to indicate whatever observations had been suggested to him by the study of the family and which had no place elsewhere. That was in itself an avowal of inability to classify certain phenomena that were recognized as important. We find nothing like this in the system (*la nomenclature*) of M. de Tourville. The twenty-five great classes of social facts of which it is composed, appear each in its place, in the order of its complexity, each vitally and intimately related to the one which precedes it. Nothing is

overlooked ; no preliminary explanation is needed, nor is any chance conclusion added. In fact, the earliest phenomena being the least complicated, the most simple, no explanation could be presented which would make them more readily understood. As for the conclusions, they must find their place among the more involved phenomena with which they are connected. All is included in the body of the monograph.

Naturally it is the workingman's family which is still made the basis of observation. It is that which the monographist is to study ; and the first and the simplest question to be answered is : On what does this family live ? In other words, what are its *means of support* ? This corresponds to the credit side of the budget presented by Le Play. But in the answer to his wholly material question are comprehended a multitude of elements which cannot be expressed in dollars and cents. Between two families which possess equal yearly resources there may exist such social differences, *from the character of these resources alone*, that they may represent classes diametrically opposed the one to the other.

Some families live on the natural products of *the locality* (*le Lieu*) which they inhabit ; such as, for example, as those of shepherds, fishermen, and hunters. Also, the savages of Africa, who live on the banana. Many who have other resources have the advantages of herbs, of sea or river fish, game, fruits, wood, and other products which can be immediately utilized. Finally, those who enjoy none of the spontaneous products of the soil, still find in the soil the basis of their industry. The husbandman transforms the soil itself ; the mason and the carpenter take from it stone and wood ; the miner goes to it for coal or precious metals ; the weaver, the blacksmith, the tailor, the cobbler work with, and the merchant exchanges products more or less directly yielded by the soil. All bear, then, to the *locality* a certain relation which must be determined, and determined exactly, for on it will depend an important characteristic of the family and



of the society which it represents. The shepherd of the steppes of Asia, who lives by his flocks, depends entirely on the conditions of the *locality*. The society to which he belongs is a *simple* society. All means of support come directly and very simply from the *soil*. On the contrary, the English workingman of Manchester lives by the wages paid by his employer, and in his *means of support* he seems to bear no relation whatever to his *locality*. By means of numerous commercial agents, and under the direction of the manufacturer, he works the wools of Australia and the cottons of the United States or of the Indies. Through other agents and under the same direction he utilizes the energy stored up in English coal, and it is in fact due to the presence of that coal in the subsoil of England that he is in communication with the locality in which he lives. His relation to the *locality* is, then, very indirect, very complicated, very loose. He represents an extreme type in a *complicated society*. Thus, while in the case of families in simple societies the means of support are derived entirely, or almost entirely, from the *locality*, in the case of complicated societies they are separated from it in an ever increasing degree. The *nomenclature* of Tourville classes them in the exact order of this increasing separation.

First comes *Labor*. The more a man uses his wits the farther he advances beyond the *simple gathering* of natural products, which is the most elementary form of labor. This *simple gathering*, then, is to be placed at the head of the table; then follow *extraction*, which draws the products of the soil directly from it, *e. g.*, the arts of agriculture and mining; *manufacture*, which transforms them; *transportation*, which distributes them.

But there are other means of support derived from resources accumulated under the form of *Property, Personal Effects, Wages and Savings*. These furnish four new classes, which added to *locality* and *labor* give the six great divisions of the *means of support*.

We know now upon what the family lives ; but we must know also its organization, the relations of its members one to another ; that is the object of the division entitled the *Workingman's Family*. We come now to the question of the *mode of life*. How does this family, which we have studied first in its workshop and then at the fireside—how does it actually utilize its resources? How is it fed, housed, clothed, cared for, amused? This corresponds to Le Play's *expense account*, with the accompanying explanatory text.

Beyond the ordinary life of the family, with which we are acquainted through these first eight tables, there is a very important series of facts which concerns it alone, but which occur only at irregular intervals ; these are the *phases of its existence*, the events which mark an epoch in its life—marriages, births, illness, deaths, new enterprises, etc. They have their proper place here, and the story of the workingman's family properly so-called ends with them.

There remains a certain class of influence outside and above the man's family itself which completes its history in one way or another : *Patronage\** and its auxiliaries, *commerce, intellectual culture, religious worship*, corresponding to higher objects, intellectual or moral needs ; *voluntary associations*, which direct the interests for which the members have voluntarily united ; and finally, *enforced associations*, which lead us to an examination of public life in its various phases. We have thus risen from the direct observation of the workingman's family to a study of all the social facts, even the most remote and the most complicated, which act upon it in any way whatsoever.

Yet we have considered the society only at home in its native environment ; we must now look at its outward *expansion*, in its active relations with the rest of the world. We must also consider it in its passive relations, that is, the action of *foreign societies* upon it. Having done this,

\*[*Patronage* is a technical term which has no English equivalent. It includes more than simply the relations between employer and employed.—THE EDITORS.]

we are in possession of all the fundamental facts which are necessary for understanding the *history of the society* and for designating the rank which it takes in the world. The crowning conclusion of the monograph is the synthesis of the different classifications which have been derived from the determination of each characteristic that has been observed.

I must ask my readers to pardon the great brevity which I have found necessary in order to put before them with a minimum of commentary the simple statement of the twenty-five great classes of social facts which compose the classification.\* Each one of these twenty-five classes is

\* SOCIAL CLASSIFICATION.

GRAND DIVISIONS OF THE CLASSIFICATION.

I. The Society at Home.	Private Life.	The Workingman's Family.	Means of Support furnished by Its Organization. Its Mode of Life. Its Phases of Existence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Locality.</li> <li>Labor.</li> <li>Property.</li> <li>Personal Effects.</li> <li>Wages.</li> <li>Savings.</li> </ul>
	Public Life.	Groupings outside and above the Workingman's Family.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Patronage.</i></li> <li>Its Auxiliaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commerce.</li> <li>Intellectual Culture.</li> <li>Religion.</li> </ul>
		Free Associations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighborhood.</li> <li>Corporations.</li> </ul>	
		Enforced Associations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Parish.</li> <li>Unions of the Parishes.</li> <li>The City.</li> <li>Provincial Divisions.</li> <li>The Province.</li> <li>The State.</li> </ul>	

II. The Society Abroad.

III. Action of Foreign Societies upon it.

IV. History of the Society.

V. Rank of the Society.

THE TWENTY-FIVE GREAT CLASSES OF SOCIAL FACTS.

- |                                    |                                   |   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <i>A.</i> The Soil.                | <i>J.</i> <i>Patronage.</i>       | <i>S.</i> Provincial Divisions.         |
| <i>B.</i> Labor.                   | <i>K.</i> Commerce.               | <i>T.</i> The Province.                 |
| <i>C.</i> Property.                | <i>L.</i> Intellectual Culture.   | <i>U.</i> The State.                    |
| <i>D.</i> Personal Effects.        | <i>M.</i> Religion.               | <i>V.</i> The Expansion of the Society. |
| <i>E.</i> Wages.                   | <i>N.</i> Neighborhood.           | <i>X.</i> Foreign Societies             |
| <i>F.</i> Savings.                 | <i>O.</i> Corporations.           | <i>Y.</i> History of the Society.       |
| <i>G.</i> The Workingman's Family. | <i>P.</i> The Parish.             | <i>Z.</i> Rank of the Society.          |
| <i>H.</i> The Mode of Life         | <i>Q.</i> Unions of the Parishes. |   |
| <i>I.</i> Phases of its Existence. | <i>R.</i> The City.               |   |

itself subdivided with great minuteness of detail, resulting in some four hundred terms which make the complete classification. One of the professors of our school, M. Robert Pinot, explains every year before a select body of students the significance of these terms, and the whole mechanism of the table. It is impossible for me within the restricted limits of a paper even to enumerate all the principles which social science has proposed to discover by monographic observation. I hope, however, that the grand divisions of this vast system where nothing is left to fancy or to chance, where each term is, so to speak, held in its place like the links in a chain, will give my readers the impression of a real, scientific advance upon family budgets with explanatory notes, which was the first form of the monograph.

Thanks to the more perfect methods of analysis, the new system admits greater flexibility in the exposition of the facts observed. Classification is so safe a guide for the monographist in his researches, that it is possible for him to do without it in drawing his conclusions. This is again an important advance upon the old system of the budget with explanations and commentary. It never occurred to M. de Tourville that all social study should begin with a description of the *soil*, followed in an invariable order by a study of *labor property*, etc. On the contrary, all the monographs published in the "Workingmen of the Two Worlds," are divided into exactly the same number of paragraphs, bearing the same titles, and following one another according to a rule previously determined. A deplorable monotony is the result. This is a grave disadvantage, for one writes generally to be read, and if the reader is discouraged, one fails to reach the end in view. But there is a still graver disadvantage, it is that this uniformity frees the monographist from the necessity of seeing the society he describes. He may note one after another the facts which he had collected, without discovering their connection, without knowing which have a real importance and which are only secondary, without understanding

what makes the strength and the weakness of the society that has been studied, without touching the mainspring of the whole, that which determines and characterizes the general movement of the society. The monographist who uses the old system may be only an unskilled workman, dumping his loads of materials in given receptacles according to his instructions. The monographist of the new school would be incapable of undertaking his work, unless he had a *clear and distinct notion of it*, unless he had discovered the cause of the facts to be presented by him. Nomenclature serves to give us a clearer view; when it has done this for us, we must show that we do see clearly by recording our observations as we see them.

An example will more readily indicate the difference between these two methods. Let us suppose that you have been delegated to describe the historic structures of Paris; you will do wisely if you take account of their construction; if you carry on your study systematically; if, for example, you examine first the foundations of the edifice, the precautions which have been taken to assure its solidity; if you proceed then to the superstructure and note the manner in which the great building has been erected; you will carefully jot down in your notebook the nature of the materials used not only in the walls, but in the beams and the rafters, the kind of mortar, the methods of joining the timbers; then you will examine its interior decoration, etc. This is the work which you must do; but are you to rehearse it all before your reader? Certainly not. If you have understood the edifice that you have been studying you will know the reason for each architectural detail that you have found; you will take into account the object of its construction, the time in which it was built, the resources offered by the place in which it stands. If you are describing a church, a theatre, a palace, a fortress, a private dwelling, you will begin by explaining to me the religious customs of the time in which the building was erected, what public frequented the

theatre, what the life of the nobles was, what were the art and the conditions of war, how family life was looked upon. In fact, it was with all that in view that the building was built; to that it owes its existence and its peculiar form; that is the point which is to be made prominent and about which the details of your study are to be grouped. If you do not succeed in so rendering yourself master of your subject that you discover the fact which is the corner-stone of all, you will not be able to interest me, unless I am a mason or an architect. In the same way a society is constructed on the foundations of pre-existing conditions and on the present necessities of the individuals who compose it. To these things it owes its existence and its form; these are the points which are to be made prominent and about which all the details of social study are to be grouped. If you do not succeed in discovering these facts which are the corner-stone of all, you will not be able to interest me, unless I am a statistician or an economist by profession.

But if classification leaves the expositor entire liberty of form, it furnishes him with a valuable guide by permitting him to grasp promptly all the important effects of a given fact. Under this guidance it becomes an easy matter to follow the fundamental rule of observation and of exposition, viz., that no phenomenon shall be presented, unless its bearing be given also. Usually it exerts more than a single effect; but there is one effect which is the most important of all, and that one is the one to be emphasized; then follow the subordinate effects, each in its place. In thus determining the bearing of every fact observed, it falls naturally into its place in the presentation of the whole. The place is not the same under all circumstances. For instance, if you are describing a family of nomadic shepherds, you will see at once that their whole existence is dependent on the *locality*. They accept all conditions of climate, of fauna, of flora, without effecting any modification whatever by the labor of tillage, without protecting themselves against the

inclemencies of the weather by ingenious systems of construction, of heating, etc. You will have to lay greater stress upon the spontaneous products of the soil on which they live than you would do in studying a workingman's family at Paris; and you will learn just what development you ought to give to the description by the interest which the study brings to you. In this manner your observations will be presented to your readers in a strictly scientific order, inasmuch as this will have been determined by the results of analysis; but this order will be one which is *peculiar to your subject*, and not general and uniform.

This method of procedure, which secures to the monographist a clear view of society, demands of him personal labor which is considerable. It has, too, the advantage of interesting the reader and of indicating to him the methods employed; it shows him continually the relations of cause and effect, instead of placing before him an enumeration of facts—it educates him.

Most monographs of the old type begin with the following sentence: "The family which we are to study is found at such and such degrees of latitude and of longitude." What does that signify to the majority of readers? Certainly very little. What does it signify even to many monographists? And if the fact furnishes some social indication, why do they not take the pains to explain it to the public? This material statement is of itself a pure geographical fact; it becomes a part of social science only when you show its value. Supposing even that you explain to me that we have to do with a region which is above the limit of forests, or with a region which is subject to a great atmospheric current which must have much influence upon the products of the soil; or, again, with a region in a tropical climate; still, what have I learned? It is not, of course, a matter of indifference from a social point of view whether one lives at the equator or at the pole; but, you must explain to me beside, what influence the given situation will exert, and explain it, moreover, in

the right place; for instance, when I encounter a phenomenon which has been influenced by the situation. Otherwise what difference will it make to me that your observations have been made in lat. 49° N.?

Briefly stated, the work accomplished by M. de Tourville resulted on the one hand in a more complete analysis and in an ampler classification; on the other hand, in an exposition at once more scientific and more interesting. But, as has been said, the new instrument demands of him who would use it greater and more personal labor. This was one of the primary causes of the hostility it has aroused. In the second place, it reaches new results. Those of Le Play's disciples who saw in him, not the founder of a method to be developed, but the champion of certain ideas, could not adopt in good faith a system which would modify certain of their opinions. Such was the real cause of the separation of the old and the new school.

I should like to illustrate to the American public by an example drawn from the United States itself the progress which has been made in the knowledge of societies by the adoption of the new method.

Le Play tried to establish in certain series of social facts a great number of partial classifications. He has, for example, in "Social Reform in France," *two principal classes* of property, *three classes* in the systems of succession, *three principal classes* in the family, *two classes* of small landowners, *four kinds* of great workshops, *two forms* of association, *two kinds* of communities, *six classes* of corporations, etc. But his method of analysis was neither exact nor complete enough to allow him to co-ordinate the classes thus determined, so that his classification failed in the scientific verification which he thought that he had found in the balance of the budgets.

It resulted from this imperfect analysis and the series left incomplete and unclassified, that several classes specified by Le Play were falsely defined. The characteristics upon which he placed emphasis were not the *main characteristics*.



For example, he distinguished three classes of families, *the patriarchal family*, *the stock family* (*la famille-souche*) and *the unstable family*, basing the divisions according to the method by which families in each generation disposed of their property, rather than according to the education which they gave their children, which is the essential function of the family. And the effect of this error was not purely speculative. Le Play lauded the family organization of the Anglo-Saxon because it permitted testamentary liberty, the integral transmission of the family estate, characteristics, to his mind, of the *stock family*. Consequently he falsely attributed the qualities of the *stock family* to all classes in which the integral transmission of estates obtained, confounding in this way under a single denomination and in a single term of praise classes of families of very different degrees of vigor. He was in this manner led to place the same value upon the Basque emigrants, or upon those of Auvergne, who never established a single colony, as upon the Scandinavian and the English emigrants, who have been considerable factors in the social constitution of Western Europe and of the New World. On the other hand, he failed to recognize the stock family when, under the influence of certain circumstances, it made no practice of integral transmission. It was thus that he was led to predict the approaching decline of England, and to form very false judgments in regard to the United States of America.

To his mind, the strength of England lay in its attachment to certain forms which to-day seem to be threatened; he became alarmed at their probable disappearance, while he did not perceive that the social qualities in its constitution which he had so justly praised, were independent of the forms under which he had observed them; that they belonged, not to such and such testamentary conditions, not to such and such a political régime, but rather to the aptitudes developed among the youth by that whole series of facts which constitutes education.

In regard to the United States his error was still more marked. There he failed to recognize the *stable family* at all because there was no integral transmission of entire estates or of an industry. The American, who usually changes his employment several times during his life, can have no great desire to preserve to the generation which is to follow him a situation which he himself would probably abandon if he lived. This arises from the very conditions of his environment, from the amount of soil at his disposal, from the number of favorable opportunities which are presented to him. Hence results a certain material instability, the mark of a society that is forming and not of a society that is declining. But Le Play, who adhered to the systems of inheritance for the determination of family classes, heaped the same reproaches upon the American family, in which no one succeeds to the father's work because each one learns to create for himself an independent life, and the *unstable family*, in which no one succeeds to the father's work because each one thinks that he will be able to live on a small portion of his patrimony.

Led astray by this false appearance, and influenced besides by the spectacles of those grave disorders of which public life in the American Union is the theatre, Le Play judged the United States with great severity, and I do not hesitate to say, with real injustice. In the introductory letter published by him in M. Claudio Jannet's work on the "United States of To-day" (*Les Etats-Unis contemporains*), he frequently insists on the *moral decadence of the Union*, and he predicts for it approaching disaster, if it does not return to better practices.

There is no need for me to call to the attention of Americans the erroneousness of these predictions. Three years ago, having had occasion to travel in the United States in pursuance of social studies, I returned to France with convictions directly opposed to those of Le Play. If I had often to record grave deficiencies and disorders, the impression of

these sources of weakness was always more than counter-balanced for me by a deep sense of the energy and the vitality of the American family, by the marvelous manner in which it responds to its purpose in furnishing to the nation a constant contribution of young men capable of making their own way and conquering their own place in the world.\* And while my observations revealed to me at every step evidences of strength in the nation and in the family, the new social science guided me in the search of characteristic phenomena, without hindering my advance by the inexact classification which had caused Le Play's mistake.

Other observations made in different countries, by the aid of the new method, soon led us to substitute for the classification established by Le Play a new classification, based not on the inheritance of property, but rather on the aptitude of children for real independence. And with this classification as a basis the American family finds its place naturally among the strongest class.

I have cited this instance to indicate to the American public the practical bearing of a more just classification and a more exact analysis upon social studies ; but this is only one example destined to open the eyes of the friends of the science to the importance of the development given by M. de Tourville to the method founded by Le Play.

It is important also to note that the modifications made in the conclusions and in the classifications advanced by Le Play, in pursuance of his method of observation, are the greatest homage that can be paid to his memory. Le Play felt the need of a compass to guide him in his social studies. We have but one ambition—to perfect his instrument *by the same method which aided him in its discovery*.

Such a task is not accomplished without accidents and the individual shipwrecks which are the part of human weakness. Our mistakes do not surprise us, nor shake our faith in the method. We have the consolation of thinking that a

\* See "*La Vie Américaine*".

false hypothesis, which had been shown to be such, is a step towards truth ; that one may even render service to the truth in deceiving oneself in good faith ; and that every loyal effort that is guided by science brings, directly or indirectly, a useful result.

It is this which leads us to hope that all sincere and enlightened minds will aid us in the work we have undertaken of making a methodical study of social facts. It is a vast undertaking ; it eluded us ; it exceeds by far our strength, our time, our personal knowledge. We do not dream of playing the jealous custodian of a system—of taking out a patent on it ; on the contrary, we ask all those who love the truth to unite their efforts with ours.

PAUL DE ROUSIERS.

*Paris.*

[Translated by CORNELIA H. B. ROGERS.]